THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IV. APRIL, 1924. No. 4.

Notes on 1 Cor. 15, 20—28.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

The past years have witnessed a remarkable revival of interest in eschatological problems, especially in the apocalyptic hope of Christendom, the *parousia* of the Lord. The late war with its terror and distress may largely account for this. The agony suffered by those whose beloved ones perished on the battlefields of Europe or in the hospitals, the cruelty and magnitude of modern warfare, the universal commotion and unrest among the nations, the anxious desire for peace on earth — all these factors cooperatel in directing the vision of man to Christ's second coming. Both millenarians and antimillenarians have evinced the same interest in matters eschatological, and preachers who have centered their message in Christ's speedy return have gathered about this single issue thousands of followers, whose daily discussion has been the end of the world, and whose avidity for further information scores of periodicals have fed with undiminished zeal.

Now, we admit that no one ought to find fault with a sane and Scriptural discussion of this subject. The Bible itself treats it in various places and with becoming earnestness. Nevertheless, the discussion becomes downright wrong and harmful when it departs from the explicit information which the Word of God offers on this score. In the aggregate, that information does not comprise a great deal. With regard to the millennium we have no conclusive evidence whatever; all that is taught concerning it by the millenarians is merely conjecture. But even the Scriptural information as regards the final judgment of the world is limited. Though Christ and the holy writers frequently speak of the end of the world and the second coming of Christ, they are more interested in urging their hearers to escape the doom of Judgment than in recounting the details of that awful manifestation of wrath

upon unbelievers. All in all, we are able to gather so much from Scripture that the Day of Judgment will be a day of unspeakable agony to the enemies of Christ and His Word, while to believers it means the final triumph of their faith in glory and the supreme realization of perfect bliss in communion with God. Hence Christians should rejoice in, and earnestly pray for, the coming of the Lord, because His advent means their consummate redemption. That is the preeminent lesson which the Scriptural passages dealing with eschatological matters would teach.

The much-disputed and fairly outraged passage, 1 Cor. 15, 20—28, should serve no other purpose. It should not inspire the Christian reader with a morbid curiosity in things he can never understand, but strengthen his hope and picture to him the ineffable glory of Christ and His Church in that everlasting day of blissful eternity. What induced the apostle to pen the passage is evident from the context. Arguing with unbelievers who denied the resurrection, Paul was obliged to treat at great length this paramount article of Christianity. To the apostle the Savior's resurrection is an undeniable fact. That Christ rose from the dead God has shown to be certain, and with equal certainty He has proved that all who die in Him will rise also, vv. 1—11. 20. Hence men err who declare: There is no resurrection. That denial controverts the entire Christian hope; for the article concerning the resurrection is the great foundation doctrine of Christianity. Those who deny it destroy the faith and leave nothing but miserable despair in the wake of their vicious infidel propaganda, vv. 12—16. "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept," v. 20. Like a paean of triumph these words ring out, ushering in an amazing series of joyous events that will take place when "in Christ shall all be made alive," v. 22. To delineate these glorious happenings is properly the burden of the message in vv. 20—28. Which are these? We may summarize them as follows: The whole race died in Adam, so the whole race will be raised from the dead in Christ, v. 22. "But every man in his own order: Christ the First-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming," v. 23. Then comes the end, when Christ will deliver up His kingdom to the Father after having subjected all hostile powers; for His reign must continue till this has been achieved. The last of these hostile powers is death, as foretold in Scripture, which says that God has put all things in subjection to His Son. Obviously, God, who has put

all things under Christ's feet, is not included in the powers made subject to Him, vv. 24—27. So, when Christ shall have subdued all things, unto Himself (at the *end,* v. 24), He will Himself be subject to God, in order that He (God) may be all in all, that is, "the indwelling power animating and controlling the whole universe," v. 28. Such is the gist of Paul's teaching in this remarkable passage.

As we reflect on the various facts here pointed out, we notice that the whole narrative is as grand and sublime as it is simple and clear. Let the reader bear in mind that this passage is the culmination of the entire epistle, in which Paul, in the main, discusses practical subjects. He is compelled to feed his readers with *γάλα* (milk) and not with *βρῶμα* (meat), chap. 3, 2. However, in the fifteenth chapter the great teacher of Gentile Christendom soars to the highest pinnacle of doctrinal conception. Nevertheless, Paul even now preserves that sanity and soberness which characterize him as a true teacher. He writes to be understood. His words are not those of a self-made frenzied prophet. He speaks with clearness, force, and precision, so that even the simplest Christian mind is able to follow his arguments. Only one statement, in a way, defies human comprehension, namely, the solemn declaration that the Son will deliver up the kingdom and Himself be subject to God. True, the words are clear enough; but is there a human mind on this side of eternity that can comprehend the height and depth of the transcendently sublime thoughts which they suggest? As long as we move in this vale of hope, we can at best but stammer a few incoherent words concerning that paramount mystery of godliness which is here revealed. Verily, the Day of Judgment will be not only a day of surpassing joy, but also one of marvelous surprises, when the veil will fall from our eyes, and we shall behold in midday splendor the marvel of God's being. Not until then will the last word be spoken in explanation of this great passage. In the mean while, however, we may clear the text of all misrepresentations and outline, though dimly, the great truths which Paul would here impress upon our hearts. There are, in the main, two errors which have been interpreted into this passage, the first imposing upon the text a *millennium,* the second declaring Christ's subordination to the Father. Let us consider these errors.

1. Does Paul in this passage teach the millennium? That is a common claim made by premillenarians. Thus we read in

Clarke's *Commentary* concerning this point: "The apostle mentions three orders here: 1) *Christ,* who rose from the dead by His own power; 2) *those that are Christ's:* all His apostles, martyrs, confessors, and faithful followers; 3) then cometh the end, when the *whole mass* shall be raised." Jamieson's *Commentary* says: "The second coming of Christ is not a mere point of time, but a period beginning with the resurrection of the just at His appearing and ending with the general Judgment. Then — after that, next in the succession of 'orders' or 'ranks' — the end, the general resurrection and final Judgment. Matt. 25, 46." Other commentaries support the same view. Peake's *Commentary* puts it thus: "This universal resurrection will not be accomplished all at once, but in stages, according to the different classes concerned. In the first stage there is Christ Himself as First-fruits; in the second, at His return, Christians; in the third stage, the rest of mankind, when He delivers up His kingdom to the Father after *He has abolished all hostile powers.*" All these statements prove the essential weakness of the millennialistic position. Their views are based upon conjecture and not on direct text evidence. Even Clarke admits: "I must confess I find nothing in the sacred writings distinctly enough marked to support this opinion of the millennium, or thousand years' reign; nor can I conceive any important end that can be answered by this procedure." This is certainly an honest confession, and every unbiased student will agree that there is nothing in the text to support the opinion concerning the millennium. The words are clear: "But every man in his own order: Christ the First-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming. Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father," vv. 23. 24. *Ταγμά,* or order, means a military division, and of such *τάγματα* the apostle mentions two, namely, Christ the First-fruits, or, according to Heb. 2, 10, the *ἀρχηγός,* the Captain, who arose in solitary glory; and *οἱ Χριστοῦ,* those who are Christ's, the great army of believers who are now sleeping and will rise at the sound of the trumpet, v. 52. Premillenarians are mistaken when they make a third *tagma* out of *τέλος,* v. 24, and refer this to the resurrection of non-Christians. This is a manifest violation of the *usus communis* of the word. *To telos* is not a synonym of *tagma.* The word means "end" and nothing else. Also this interpretation violates the context. The *εἶτα* in v. 24 clearly refers to *ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.* What the text says is simply this, that at

Christ's coming the believers in Christ will rise, after which will be the end, which concludes the world's history. True, the apostle does not especially mention the resurrection of the non-Christians. Rightly *The Expositor's Greek Testament* remarks: "Their introduction is irrelevant. Paul has proved the resurrection of Christ and is now making out that the resurrection of His sleeping ones is bound up with His own. Christ and Christians are the participants in the resurrection of life." What will happen to non-Christians the apostle clearly states in other places of his epistles. Here, where he purposes to comfort those who believe, he simply stresses the consolatory hope that is wrapped up in Christ's resurrection. As Christ rose, so shall also they rise to glory when Christ's *parousia* will bring about the end of the world. Very clearly Heinrici expresses this thought when he says: "Lag es hier ferner in seinem [des Apostels] Gesichtskreis, in einer Verhandlung, welche Zweifel an der Auferstehung bei Christen beseitigen will, Aufschluesse einzufuegen, welche τοὺς ἔξω angehen? Ist ueberhaupt die Annahme eines zwischen der Parousie und dem *telos* 'fortgesetzten Siegens Christi ueber alle Feindesgewalt' statthaft, da doch die Parousie, wie auch die Erlaeuterung des *telos* V. 24. 25 zeigt, der bereits vollendete Sieg ist? Daher entspricht es vielmehr der Tendenz des Abschnitts, mit den meisten Auslegern *to telos* von dem Ende des gegenwaertigen Weltalters, der Endvollendung, dem schliesslichen Ausgang der Dinge, und zwar mit Beziehung auf die ἐν Χριστῷ, zu verstehen. Zieht man dazu in Betracht, dass *to telos* eintritt, wenn der Sohn das von ihm eroberte und verwaltete Reich dem Vater uebergibt, so darf der Begriff naeher bestimmt werden als Vollendung des Werkes Christi." (*K. E. Kommentar* von Dr. H. A. W. Meyer, 1888.) Considering these facts, it is evident that Clarke is fully justified in declaring: "I find nothing in the sacred writings distinctly enough marked to support this opinion of the millennium, or thousand years' reign."

2. Another question that arises in connection with the text is: Does this passage teach subordinationism in the Trinity? In particular, does it in any way suggest any essential inferiority of the Son to the Father? Advocates of subordinationism have regarded v. 28 as one of the *loci classici* supporting their view. From the statement: "Then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him," they have concluded that the *Logos* must needs be inferior to the Father. In making this

inference, however, they forget some important truths which must be borne in mind in interpreting this passage.

a) In his epistles St. Paul nowhere teaches, but rather precludes the idea of, subordination in the Trinity, by teaching the numerical sameness of the essence in the persons of the Godhead; as, for instance, in chap. 1, 3, where he wishes his readers grace and peace from God, our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. With regard to the force expressed in this parallelism *The Expositor's Greek Testament* quotes Ellicott, who says: "The union of *θεοῦ* and *κυρίου* under the *vinculum* of a common preposition is one of the numberless hints scattered through St. Paul's epistles of the consciously felt and recognized coordination of the Father and Christ." (Cp. also 1 Cor. 12, 4—7; 2 Cor. 13, 14, etc.)

b) This passage does not speak of that subordination which the advocates of this peculiar doctrine profess; it only tells of a willing subjection, which takes place at the end of time. In support of their argument they therefore cite a passage which in no wise treats of the matter they wish to prove. They contend that the *Logos* is essentially inferior to the Father, whereas the passage in question does not at all speak of an essential relation of the Son to the Father.

c) Paul clearly emphasizes the fact that Christ will be subject to the Father *in connection with His voluntary surrender of the kingdom to God.* Clarke rightly remarks: "Our Lord Jesus is represented here as administering the concerns of the Kingdom of Grace in this lower world during the time that this divine economy lasts; and when the end — the time determined by the wisdom of God — comes, then, as there is no longer any need of this administration, the kingdom is delivered up to the Father." This must be borne in mind if we are to gauge the text correctly. According to God's Word the Father has delivered all things unto the Son, Matt. 11, 27. He has appointed Him King, Savior, and Judge of all men. John 5, 22; Acts 17, 31. To Him He has given all power in heaven and in earth. Matt. 28, 18. It is this truth to which Paul refers in v. 24. Christ must reign in His capacity of Savior-King until He has fulfilled the predictions concerning Himself, and especially until He has conquered all enemies, v. 25. Ps. 2, 6—12; 110, 1. When this has been accomplished, — the last enemy being death, v. 26, — then Christ will present to God the kingdom, v. 24, "a realm dominated by God's will," God's holy Church, of which Christ is the Head, and with which He is united

in mystic union. This, evidently, is the meaning of vv. 24 and 28. In a manner not clearly revealed to us, Christ will subject Himself freely and willingly in connection with the delivering up of the Church, which is His body. Of course, this does not mean that Christ will cease to rule, for His kingdom is eternal. Dan. 7, 14. It does, however, mean that *God's* eternal Kingdom of Glory will then be inaugurated. Since the object of Christ's mediatorship has been attained, the *present mode* of Christ's rule will cease, or rather, it will be exalted to that perfect form in which God is all in all. The Son, as Savior and Ruler of a kingdom the purpose of which was to glorify God (Luke 2, 49; John 4, 34), will no longer exercise any *distinct dominion,* since the persons of the Trinity will no longer act distinct or separate parts, but *God will be all in all,* that is, "God will be everywhere regnant and His Being everywhere imminent." Very aptly Gerhard remarks: "Scriptura enim duplex corpus Christo tribuit, personale, quod in *Λόγου ὑπόστασιν* assumpsit, et spirituale sive mysticum, quod spiritus sui vinculo sibi copulavit, cujus corporis membra sunt omnes vere credentes. De hoc mystico corpore apostolus proprie loquitur, quando Christum Patri suo in die novissimo subjiciendum asserit." (*De Jud. Extr.,* § 112; quoted in Dr. Pieper's *Dogmatik,* Vol. II, p. 470.)

We repeat: Does this free and willing subjection in connection with the Church involve any essential inferiority on the part of Christ? *The Expositor's Greek Testament* answers this question as follows: "It affirms no other subjection of the Son than is involved in sonship. This implies no inferiority of nature, no extrusion from power, but the free submission of love." Again: "This solemn conclusion (*πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*) most fitly expresses the loyal purpose of the Son in His self-subjection, *whose submission exhibits the unity of the Godhead* (John 10, 30—36; 17, 22) and constitutes itself the focus and uniting bond of a universe in which God's will is everywhere regnant and His being everywhere imminent." This is true; for the text nowhere states that the distinction in the persons of the glorious Trinity will cease, or that the relation of the Son to the Father will undergo a change. In fact, such an idea is excluded. The *θεός* who will be all in all is the *Triune God,* who *never changes,* but is invariable *in being* as well as *in purpose.* Mal. 3, 6; Jas. 1, 17.

Hence only those who deny the doctrine regarding the true relation of the Son to the Father, as taught in John 10, 30, etc.,

distort this text to prove subordinationism. To those who accept the clear Scripture-passages teaching the numerical unity in trinity this passage presents no difficulties, although there remain mysteries which will not be solved until we shall see God face to face. We therefore find that all Christian scholars who accept the essential deity of Christ are in substantial accord in interpreting this passage, as the following quotations will show.

The *Weimarische Bibel* sums up the matter thus: "Er wird das Reich, welches er bisher mitten unter seinen Feinden in der streitenden Kirche gefuehrt, seinem Vater, von dem er es empfangen hat, wieder ueberantworten (V. 24) und hiermit oeffentlich bezeugen, dass er nach seiner menschlichen Natur, nach der ihm die Macht zu herrschen vom Vater in der Zeit gegeben ist, ihm untertaenig sei, und alsdann wird auch sein geistlicher Leib Gott dem HErrn voellig untertaenig sein, weil er ohne alle Widersetzung der Feinde und sonderlich der Suende in ihnen voellig und ruhig herrschen wird. 'Auf dass Gott sei alles in allen,' dass er nicht mehr durchs Wort, sondern ohne Mittel, durch sich selbst, in ihnen herrsche, aller seiner himmlischen Gueter sie teilhaftig mache, sich voellig ihnen zu erkennen gebe und sie an Leib und Seele durch sein seligmachendes Anschauen saettige." [1])

Bengel (tr. by C. F. Werner) *ad locum:* "Der Sohn wird dem Vater untertan sein, und das freiwillig. . . . Es ist jedoch hier nicht die Rede vom Sohne, insofern der Vater und der Sohn eins sind — diese Einheit des Wesens wird in unserer Stelle vorausgesetzt —, sondern es ist hier von dem Sohn die Rede im Hinblick auf die goettliche Haushaltung, sofern der Vater dem Sohn alles untergetan hat. Wenn aber gesagt wird, der Sohn werde dem Vater untertan sein, so ist dieses Wort viel angemes-

---

1) The *Weimar Bible* sums up the matter as follows: "He will again deliver the kingdom, which He has hitherto governed, surrounded by His enemies in the Church Militant, to His Father, from whom He has received it (v. 24), and thus He will publicly testify that according to His human nature, according to which the power of ruling was given Him by the Father in time, He will be subject to Him. Then also shall His spiritual body be altogether subject to the Lord God, because He will fully and gloriously reign in them [those who constitute His spiritual body] without any opposition on the part of His enemies and especially of sin. 'That God may be all in all,' that is, He will no longer rule in them through the Word, but without means, through Himself, making them partakers of His heavenly gifts, revealing Himself to them in His supreme glory and satisfying them both as to body and soul by their beatific vision of Him."

sener und wuerdiger, als wenn es hiesse: *unterworfen.* . . . Es ist also nicht so zu verstehen, als ob es hiesse: er wird untertan *gemacht werden,* sondern er wird sich selber untertan machen. . . . Die Untertaenigkeit und der Gehorsam des Sohnes gegen den Vater heben die Gleichheit der Macht nicht auf und beweisen keine Verschiedenheit des Wesens. Der Sohn erkennt mit hoechster Ehrfurcht in alle Ewigkeit, dass er von Ewigkeit vom Vater gezeugt sei; er erkennt auch, dass er ein geistliches Reich vom Vater empfangen habe und zum HErrn der ganzen Welt eingesetzt worden sei. Diese seine allerheiligste Ehrfurcht, Untertaenigkeit und kindliche Liebe wird er aller Kreatur kundmachen, damit alle Ehre dem ewigen Vater dargebracht werde. Aber damit geht dem Sohn nichts ab, denn der Vater will, dass alle den Sohn ehren, wie sie den Vater ehren, Joh. 5, 23; Roem. 14, 11. . . . 'Auf dass Gott sei alles in allen.' Hier kommt wieder etwas Neues, und zwar das Hoechste, das Ewigbleibende, der immerwaehrende Zweck, zur Sprache. Alles und also auch alle werden dem Sohn untertan sein, der Sohn aber dem Vater, und wird keine Einsprache geschehen, keine Kreatur sich dazwischenlegen, kein Feind es hindern. Alles wird sagen: Gott ist mir alles. Und dies ist das letzte Ziel, der aeusserste Endpunkt des Ganzen, ueber den auch ein Apostel nicht weiter hinaus weiss." [2]

---

2) Bengel (*Gnomon,* ad loc.): "The Son will be subject to the Father, and that of His own choice. . . . This, however, is not predicated of the Son in so far as He and the Father are one; for the unity of the divine essence is here presupposed. But it is said of the Son respecting the divine economy, inasmuch as the Father has subjected all things to the Son. Likewise, when we are told that the Son shall be subject to the Father, this is far more appropriate and adequate than if the text would read: He shall be subjected. . . . We are indeed not to take the expression in the sense of: He shall be *made* subject, but rather as saying: He *will subject Himself.* . . . The subjection and obedience of the Son to the Father do not destroy the equality of divine power, nor do they prove a difference in the divine essence. With due respect the Son will eternally acknowledge that He has been generated from the Father; so also will He declare that He has received His spiritual kingdom from the Father and has been constituted by Him Lord of the whole world. This most holy deference, subjection, and filial love He will make known to every creature, in order that they may give all honor to the eternal Father. However, in doing so, the Son shall not forego anything; for the Father wants all to honor the Son even as they honor the Father. John 5, 23; Rom. 14, 11. 'That God may be all in all.' Here the apostle mentions something new, and indeed that which is highest and forever remaining, the everlasting purpose and goal. All things, and therefore all creatures, will be subject to the Son, but the Son will be sub-

Heinrici (Meyers *Kommentar,* 1888): "Der Zweck aber des goettlichen *ὑποτάσσειν* ist die absolute Gottesherrschaft: 'damit Gott das Saemtliche in Saemtlichen sei,' das heisst, damit Gott das einzige und unmittelbare, allbestimmende Prinzip im innern Leben aller Mitglieder des bisher von Christo beherrschten Reiches sei. Nicht als ob das bis dahin dauernde Herrschen Christi die Erreichung dieses Ziels gehindert haette, aber gedient hat es diesem Ziel als seiner schliesslichen Bestimmung, deren vollendete Erfuellung die vollendete 'Ehre Gottes des Vaters' (Phil. 2, 11) ist in Ewigkeit." [3]

Luther: "Das scheinen eitel dunkle Worte, ist aber alles, wie ich gesagt habe, dahin geredet, dass er einen Unterschied setze des Reichs Gottes und Christi, wiewohl es doch an ihm selbst einerlei Reich ist. Aber darum heisst es jetzt Christi, dass wir hier darin leben im Glauben und nicht ihn leiblich sehen noch hoeren, wie man einen weltlichen Koenig sieht vor Augen sitzen in seinem Reich mit der koeniglichen Krone und grosser, herrlicher Pracht. Denn es ist noch nicht offenbar, was wir an ihm haben und durch das Evangelium, Sakrament und Glauben erlangen sollen. Danach aber wird's heissen Gottes Reich, wenn es nicht mehr verborgen, sondern vor allen Kreaturen offenbar werden und der Glaube aufhoeren soll; welches er heisst, das Reich dem Vater ueberantworten, das ist, uns und seine ganze Christenheit offenbarlich darstellen vor dem Vater in die ewige Klarheit und Herrlichkeit, dass er selbst regiere ohne allen Deckel. Doch nichtsdestoweniger wird Christus in seiner Herrschaft und Majestaet bleiben, denn er ist derselbige Gott und Herr, ewig und allmaechtig mit dem Vater. Aber weil er jetzt so regiert durch sein Wort, Sakrament usw., dass es die Welt nicht sieht, so heisst es Christi Reich und muss alles ihm untertan sein . . . bis an den Juengsten Tag, da er's alles wird aufheben und sich alsdann mit seinem ganzen Reich dem Vater untergeben und zu ihm sagen: Ich habe bisher mit dir

---

ject to the Father. There will be no opposition, for no creature will intervene, and no enemy will prevent it. All will say: God is all to me. And this is the final goal, the extreme point of the whole, beyond which even an apostle does not know anything."

3) Heinrici (Meyer's Commentary, 1888): "The object of the divine *ὑποτάσσειν* is the absolute rule of God. 'That God may be all in all,' that is, that God may be the only and immediate all-determining principle in the inner life of all members of the kingdom hitherto ruled by Christ. Not as if the rule of Christ till then had hindered the reaching of this goal. It has rather served this object as its final end, the consummation of which is the perfect and eternal 'glory of God the Father,' Phil. 2, 11.

regiert im Glauben, das gebe ich dir ueber, dass sie nun sehen, wie ich in dir und du in mir seiest samt dem Heiligen Geist in *einer* goettlichen Majestaet, und alles dir offenbarlich haben und geniessen, was sie bisher geglaubt und gewartet haben." (St. L. VIII, 1186).[4]

"Siehe das ist der Trost, so wir auf jenes Leben haben, dass Gott selbst soll unser und alles in uns sein. Denn nimm dir vor alles, was du gerne haettest, so wirst du nichts Besseres noch Lieberes finden zu wuenschen, denn Gott selbst zu haben, welcher ist das Leben und ein unausschoepflicher Abgrund alles Guten und ewiger Freude. . . . Summa, woran dein Herz wird Lust und Freude suchen, das soll reichlich da sein. Denn es heisst, Gott soll selbst alles in allen sein. Wo aber Gott ist, da muessen alle Gueter mit sein, so man immer wuenschen kann." (St. L. VIII, 1192 f.)[5]

---

4) Luther: "These things appear to be nothing else than incomprehensible words. However, as I have said before, they are to show us that he [the apostle] differentiates between the kingdom of God and that of Christ, although it is really but one kingdom. Nevertheless it is called Christ's kingdom, since we now live in it by faith and neither see nor hear Him bodily, nor behold His royal crown and His great and glorious majesty. For it is not yet made manifest to us what we possess in Him and what we shall obtain through the Gospel, the Sacraments, and faith. Then, however, it will be called God's kingdom, because it will be concealed no longer, but will be revealed to all creatures, and faith shall cease. What he calls 'delivering up the kingdom to the Father' means nothing else than that He will present us and all Christians to the Father in eternal glory and majesty, so that He Himself shall rule without a veil. Nevertheless, Christ will remain in His kingdom and majesty, for He is the same God and Lord, eternal and omnipotent, as the Father. Since, however, He now so rules by His Word, Sacraments, etc., that the world cannot see it, it is called Christ's kingdom, and all things must be subject to Him . . . until Judgment Day, when He will put down all rule and subject Himself together with His kingdom to the Father, saying: I have hitherto reigned with Thee in faith; now I am delivering the kingdom to Thee that they may see that Thou art in me and I in Thee together with the Holy Ghost in one divine majesty, and that they may have and enjoy in full manifestation all things in Thee which hitherto they have believed and longed for." (St. L. Ed. VIII, 1186.)

5) "Behold, that is the comfort which we have in yonder life, namely, that God Himself shall be ours and all within us. For think of all things which you may desire, and you will neither find nor wish anything more precious than to have God Himself, who is Life and the inexhaustible Fountain of all blessings and of eternal joy. . . . In fine, whatever your heart may desire to enjoy, that you shall fully have. For we are told that God Himself will be all in all. But where God is, there all blessings must be which one may desire." (St. L. Ed. VIII, 1192. 1193.)

This interpretation by the great Reformer satisfies both the content and the purpose of the text. The purpose is to direct the believer's attention to the ineffable glory which shall be his in communion with the Triune God, the Author of salvation and the Source of supreme bliss. If the discussion of matters eschatological serves to increase faith in our adorable Redeemer and hope in the glorious salvation prepared for us by the Triune God, it is not in vain; for "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15, 4.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

"**The Unifying Principle in Religion**" was the subject of Prof. W. A. Brown's address at the opening of the eighty-eighth academic year at Union Theological Seminary. The speaker discarded such conventional classifications of religion as Christian and non-Christian, Catholic and Protestant, Traditionalist and Modernist. Neither of these opposites covers the complicated situation of to-day, he thinks. Even the current denominational classifications he finds irrelevant. "When you have called a man a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, a Baptist or a Methodist, you have by no means settled what kind of man he is." Religion, according to Dr. Brown, is tested by the manner in which it relates itself to social conditions. "The competing types of Christianity . . . must stand or fall by their power to enlarge and enrich life [meaning this present life; the life eternal was a minor detail with the speaker; in fact, he did not touch upon it at all]. So far as any one of the great historic types of religion helps men to a richer and fuller life, it is good and ought to be encouraged; so far as it narrows and impoverishes, it is bad and ought to be condemned." Christian missionaries to the pagans find that "they are not people without religion. . . . They are as conscious as we of possessing a divine revelation and differ as widely as ourselves in the way they interpret it. All the different varieties of religion which we find among Christians meet us in each of the great religions." The scheme of classification which the speaker applied was based on differences in religious experience, answering to differences in the attitude which one takes toward the existing social order. "There are religious people who are satisfied with the Church as it is," just as there are people who have no fault to find with society as it is. Theirs is the imperialistic type of religion. They "believe that they commune with God most perfectly through allegiance to some existing organization whose triumph in the world they identify with the victory of God's will." Next there is the individualistic type, composed of people who

"regard the Church as corrupt or negligible and believe that religion is capable of complete description in terms of the relation between the individual soul and God," just as there are people who "protest against the existing social order as corrupt or negligible and find in their own inner life a sufficient refuge and compensation." These people believe that they can "best commune with God when they withdraw their attention from all that is finite and transitory and concentrate it upon the attempt to realize the immediate presence of God" — what we would call *Schwaermer*. Lastly, there are people "who believe that God is forming out of the present world a better society, the kingdom of God, and that it is the privilege of every true religious man to cooperate with his fellows in hastening the coming of that kingdom," just as there are people who "believe that society itself is in process of remaking into new and better forms, and that each man and woman may have his part in that remaking." This is the democratic type; its representatives are "persuaded that they commune with God most truly as they join their fellows in common search for truth, goodness, and beauty. They are convinced that God's will is being progressively revealed to those who in humility and faith join in remaking the institution of society (including the Church itself) according to a constantly clearer apprehension of God." Each of these types has its good and its bad side. "No one type of religion can include all the truth or do full justice to the beautiful and the good." The unifying process is to merge what is good in each and ignore or eliminate what is bad in each. — To the Bible Christians other classifications of religions suggest themselves; for instance, on the basis of Acts 4, 12 all religions are divided into one that saves and all the rest that do not save. Or on the basis of Rom. 3, 20—26 religions may be divided into all those which fail to justify the sinner before God, and the one religion which does. Or, according to 2 Cor. 5, 19—21, men either accept the reconciliation with God by Christ, or they do not, etc., etc. Dr. Brown would make Jesus the unifying center and force in religion, provided Jesus is properly presented, thus: "To Catholic, to Protestant, to men of other religions, to men of no faith at all, Jesus has proved Himself the word of God — the point of contact between the human and the divine." (Mark this definition of "the word of God"!) "When, however, this vital aspect of Jesus' personality has been allowed to fall into the background, the doctrine of Christ's deity has had precisely the opposite effect [*i. e.*, it cannot serve as a unifying center]. The shell has pressed so hard that it has stifled the life it was meant to protect. Instead of teaching that Jesus has set each of us free to seek God for himself, theologians have explained the doctrine of Christ's deity as meaning that it is sinful to let our thought of Jesus differ from the thoughts of other men before us. Instead of assuring us that God is like Jesus, and therefore we can go to Him freely and boldly, they have told us that, since Jesus is God, He cannot be the friendly human figure the gospels make Him. When one studies the history of dogma and compares what it is to what it might have been, one is led to repeat the

cry of Mary at the sepulcher: 'They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him.'" What an idolatress Mary must have been to call a Jesus who is not God "Lord"! Evidently she, too, missed "the unifying principle." So did the whole company of the disciples: these bigots were all obsessed with the thought that Jesus is God, yea, "very God," and claimed that this notion had been implanted in them by Jesus Himself and flowed into their writings by the Holy Spirit. The gospels and the epistles will all have to be revised to conform them to "the unifying principle." — Dr. Brown favors the third type of religion, but wants his religious democrat to share his Jesus with the religious imperialist and the religious individualist. All will find in Jesus — that is, the Brown species of Jesus — "something for which Christless souls search in vain." — The question to which religion must be accorded moral excellence, supernatural features, and doctrinal authority is hopelessly perplexing to Dr. Brown; he finds these characteristics in Hinduism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism as well as in Christianity. He also finds that they have tested each religion for its creative power: "they have taken what was helpful and let the rest go." The conquering religion in Dr. Brown's view will be the religion that will stand "the test to which Jesus appealed — its ability to produce more abundant life." Perhaps it has escaped Dr. Brown that Jesus has spoken these words of Himself, His work as Redeemer, and His teaching as the Light, the Life, and the Truth. — If we are not mistaken, Dr. Brown is the Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Seminary.

DAU.

Comparative Giving. — In the *Lutheran Church Herald* (January 8) Dr. Carl Ackermann offers an interesting article on comparative giving, in which he claims "that the real purpose of giving has not been attained." He publishes three tables of figures as follows: —

I. Contributions of Seventeen Leading Denominations.

	Benevolences.	*Congr. Expenses.*	*Totals.*
Seventh-day Adventists	$32.42	$100.24	$132.66
United Presbyterian Church	15.56	23.55	39.11
Moravian Church (North)	11.67	13.38	25.05
Presbyterian Church (South)	10.41	18.11	28.52
Evangelical Association	8.50	17.55	26.05
Northern Baptist Convention	7.16	15.48	22.64
Congregational Church	6.36	19.13	25.49
United Evangelical Church	6.32	15.79	22.09
Methodist Episcopal Church (North)	6.23	15.74	21.97
Reformed Church in America	6.04	20.43	26.47
Protestant Episcopal Church	5.52	26.11	31.63
Presbyterian Church (North)	5.46	19.07	24.53
Reformed Church in United States	5.06	9.91	14.97
Christian Church	4.69	6.35	11.04
Evangelical Lutheran Church	4.10	15.53	19.63
Evangelical Synod of North America	4.06	14.34	18.40
Disciples of Christ	2.83	8.07	10.90

Figures released by United Stewardship Council.

II. Contributions of Some Lutheran Bodies.

	Benev-olences.	*Congr. Expenses.*	*Totals.*
United Danish Church	$6.14	$ 9.44	$15.58
Augustana Synod	5.41	15.10	20.51
Norwegian Lutheran Church	5.04	4.41	9.45
Joint Synod of Ohio	4.45	10.21	14.66
United Lutheran Church	4.17	13.05	17.22
Missouri Synod	3.77	10.93	14.70
Iowa Synod	3.41	6.75	10.16
Wisconsin Synod	3.05	7.89	10.94
Buffalo Synod	2.73	9.06	11.79

III. Relative Expenditure for Leading Luxuries and the Church.

Luxurious food, etc.	$5,000,000,000
Luxurious services	3,000,000,000
Joy-riding, pleasure resorts, races, etc.	3,000,000,000
Tobacco, cigars, cigarets, etc.	2,000,000,000
Carpets, rugs, and wearing-apparel (in excess of moderate prices)	1,500,000,000
Luxuries in hotels and restaurants	750,000,000
Cakes, confections, etc.	500,000,000
Ice cream and beverages	500,000,000
Expenditures of all religions in United States, nearly	400,000,000

Since the matter is one of general interest, we publish the figures for what they are worth. It goes without saying that even the most exact, the most accurate statistics are misleading. Nevertheless, some of the remarks which Dr. Ackermann bases upon these figures are worth noting. He says: —

"In charity, however, we must look upon most cases as due rather to ignorance or a lack of proper knowledge. They do not wish to be antagonistic to the will of the Lord, but they do not sufficiently know it. Evidently they do not sufficiently know their Bibles; they are not Bible students in the real sense of the term. But this does not give an explanation that fully meets the case. Does not the fault lie somewhere else? Is it not perhaps due to the fact that pastors and teachers fail to make clear to Christian people the will of the Lord in the matter of giving? The writer is confident that this is often the case. The duty of giving is not in itself so plain to Christian people even as to make careful instruction in this matter superfluous. The whole spirit of the age is against it, and the heart of man is in accord with the spirit. A plain duty therefore rests upon every pastor. I have already pointed it out in a general way; let us look at it more in detail."

Quite interesting are his remarks on tithing. He says: —

"Is it a pastor's duty to point to the Old Testament law of tithes and emphasize that as the measure of giving as the Adventists do? That would perhaps be the most effective way of securing funds for the Church. If every member gave a tenth of his income, I am convinced the Church would fairly 'roll in money' as compared with her present resources. It seems to have been a very wise arrangement in the Jewish economy; why not now? As a suggestion for the aid of

Christian people in planning their offerings to the Church, it might serve a very good purpose. But no student of the New Testament could be satisfied with such a system. The law of giving among the Jews belonged to the period of preparation. When Christ came, these things passed away, the reality had come. The temporary law of tithes must not be forced upon Christians. They are no more under the Law, but under grace. I doubt whether it could be justly applied either in our present economic life. The industrial world is so different to-day from what it was in Bible times. As a result incomes are sometimes very low and sometimes very high. A tenth of the small income might be prohibitive, while a tenth of the large income could be given so easily that it would not have even the show of sacrifice or self-denial. Half of it could be given and still leave room for a life of luxury. No, the tithe system is not an equitable or practical plan for present-day conditions. For the man of moderate means it may, as said before, serve as a guide."

With regard to the expenditure for luxuries Dr. Ackermann has this to say: —

"I have given above a table of comparisons of the outlay of our people for luxuries and of giving to the Church. Should the pastor perhaps preach against all luxuries and demand that all such outlay should be devoted to the Church? Again, this would not be in accord with the spirit of the Gospel. There is no doubt in my mind that the standard of living in our land is very high, and that we indulge in luxuries all too much. But are we justified in declaring as carnal every enjoyment offered in the world over and above the bare necessaries of life? Many of those who are really consecrated to the service of the Master would perhaps protest against any such declaration, and justly so. They could justly say that God has not been so niggardly in dealing out His gifts to men that they must always return to Him, if His work is to prosper, all but that which is necessary for bare subsistence. No, even in nature around us He gives us many things to enjoy that we do not just need. It has pleased God to clothe this world in beauty and to make us capable of enjoying it. In many other ways He has fairly overwhelmed us with blessings and without a doubt given them for us to enjoy. . . . Of course, there is a limit beyond which the matter of luxuries should not go. We as a people have gone beyond that limit and should retrench and give the Lord His due. In the table above, which compares the expenditures for the chief luxuries with those for the Church, the whole American people is taken into consideration. The members of the Church comprise about forty per cent. of our population. In the expenditures for some of these luxuries I believe the church people have kept pace with the rest of our people, in others not. Let us, then, estimate the expenditures for luxuries on the part of members of the Church as only thirty per cent. of the whole. This is certainly not too high an estimate. Doing this, we shall have an expenditure for luxuries more than thirteen times as great as the expenditures for the Church. If all luxuries should be tabooed, it is hardly treating the

Lord's work with proper consideration to spend thirteen dollars or more for luxuries to every dollar given to the Lord. And again, it is hardly fair when it becomes necessary to curtail expenses, when the income has fallen off, to continue in a general way our expenditures for automobiles, candy, tobacco, etc., and let the work of the Lord practically take care of itself. The Lord's bountiful hand is stretched out over us, but His bounties are not to be used simply for selfish ends."

While we cannot quote the entire article, we believe that the closing paragraph contains some vital truths, which dare not be underestimated: —

"If we look at the first table given above and note the liberal contributions of the Seventh-day Adventists as compared with our own, we should be filled with a sense of shame. They are indeed called upon to give a tenth, but they give it nevertheless. Note, too, that they are giving it to promulgate error. Because of their views on the Sabbath many of them seem to make that the sum total of what they believe. In the preaching of their doctrines they show a zeal generally that puts to shame many churches not so deeply rooted in error, and it certainly shames us, who are the true children of the Reformation. Here we are in possession of its glorious heritage, blessed with the treasures of salvation as no others are, called therefore to proclaim these treasures in an especial manner, and yet we are doing so little. What an inglorious testimony we are giving to the world! Need we be surprised if it doubts the sincerity of our profession? Dear reader, if we are really sincere in our profession, how can we excuse our penuriousness before the bar of God? 'To whom much is given, of him much shall be required.' If the Lord has poured out His blessings upon us so bountifully and given us such clear insight into the doctrines of His Word, how can we hide that light under a bushel by refusing to furnish such support to the Church that she may do her God-given work? Would to God that the call for help coming to us from Europe in its helplessness would so awaken us to a sense of the duty of giving that our generation will give the Church a full and glorious opportunity to preach the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout the earth. Then will she become what the Lord wants her to be, 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun,' a salt and a light to the world." MUELLER.

Liberalists and Creeds. — The question as to how the churches are to deal with Liberalists in their midst has been widely discussed in the daily press. Some of the opinions of the press have been published in the *Presbyterian* (January 17), and they show that the ordinary Christian is thoroughly convinced of the dishonesty of those clergymen who retain their position in churches whose creeds they deny. While many of the editorials express the thought that men should be "as free to teach as the winds are to blow," yet the consensus of opinion is that it is downright unfair for liberalistic ministers to remain in churches with whose confessions they do not agree. Thus the *Pittsburgh Gazette-Times* declares: —

"No Church can, without self-stultification, retain in its ministry men who deny that which the Church deems indispensable doctrine. The Church cannot, of course, order the mind of any man and make him believe that which he cannot believe. And no honest man will teach what he is convinced is not true. It were better, then, that the religious who find themselves out of accord with ancient doctrines go their own way in peace, leaving it to the established churches to pursue their important and highly valuable labors in accordance with unalterable convictions.

"Fundamentalists cannot recall Modernists to the beliefs of their fathers, while Modernists cannot hope to convert more than a relatively small number of present Fundamentalists to their newer conceptions of truth. In the end the Modernists will have to set up a new fold. It would be better that they go out quietly, as was done by the venerable rector of St. Bartholomew's in New York, who divested himself of the symbols of priesthood during Sabbath services and quit the Church with whose authoritative tenets he is no longer in agreement."

The *Nation* writes: "It is not easy to answer such an argument as the Philadelphia Convention of Presbyterian Fundamentalists set forth: 'We believe that men should be as free to teach as the winds are to blow. But we also believe that the Presbyterian Church is a Church whose creed in the most explicit and unmistakable language commits its ministers to certain definite views of Christ and the Scriptures. No men should be ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church who cannot cheerfully accept the doctrinal teachings, and to countenance in Presbyterian pulpits a teaching which violates the creed of the Church is as contrary to right as it is contrary to common sense.' It is not enough to say in reply that liberals are good men or fine preachers. It is not enough to talk of tolerance. All that may have a psychological effect on the churches; but, logically, it is necessary to prove that creeds do not mean what they say or are more elastic than they seem."

The *Wall Street Journal* says: "Ministers who do not believe what they professed to believe when they were ordained would resign their jobs if they had the self-respect of the business men they are only too ready to lecture."

The *National Republican, Washington, D. C.,* has this to say: "The duty of the clergymen who do not believe in the fundamental doctrines of the churches from whose pulpits they preach is plain enough. There is plenty of room on the outside of any institution, religious or secular, for those whose consciences rebel against accepting its articles of faith. There is no particular courage involved in self-righteously airing one's inability to believe in the doctrines of an institution to which one has voluntarily yielded his alleged allegiance. The courage comes in when the dissenter abandons the advantages which come to him through his professed affiliation and takes his chance in the wide field, where one can believe and teach what he pleases without being guilty of disloyalty to the cause he is supposed to represent."

To the confessional Lutheran, who is accustomed to both *Lehreinigkeit* and *Lehrzucht,* it seems strange that these truths, which are so self-evident, need be pointed out at all. Plain honesty as well as the Holy Scriptures demand that those who are no longer Christians should also no longer pose as Christians. The fault of not observing this simple rule lies with the Fundamentalists as well as with the Liberalists. Indeed, we may go farther and seek it in the basic disregard which Calvinism has always shown toward the Word of God. Not purity of doctrine, but rather holiness of life has been the purpose and slogan of the Reformed churchman; hence a rationalistic element in their doctrinal system is apparent from the beginning. Liberalism is only the logical development of Calvinism. Keeping these facts in mind, we need not be surprised that Liberalists are tolerated in the Reformed churches to-day. Also where, as in the Reformed churches, the doctrine concerning the Church is misinterpreted, the Church being regarded as a sanitarium or a house of correction, we need not look for any other results than those which we find to-day. While we deeply sympathize with the Fundamentalists, honesty and Christian love compel us to point out to them where they, too, are at fault; for no good will come of the issue unless, in fighting liberalism, the Reformed churches take the stand which the Lutheran Church has advocated from the beginning. MUELLER.

Private Judgment and the Roman Catholic Church. — The principle of the right of private judgment is a thorn in the flesh of the Roman Catholic Church. In a recent article of the *America* a writer says that a Protestant "has always been taught to believe that his own private judgment is his rule of what is true in religion." The right of private judgment, he says, has been "the disastrous thing about the Reformation." Again the writer says: "Protestantism, looked at as a whole, whether in history or to-day, is a babel of conflicting doctrines. Each sect of Protestantism is a babel of conflicting doctrines. And the reason why these conflicting doctrines exist is inherent in Protestantism itself. It carries its own self-destroying poison in itself."

What are the "corrections" which the Roman Catholic Church would make? The writer in the *America* says: "Protestantism has split up into ever new sects and divisions of sects because it is not a teaching Church, and the Church which is not a teaching Church is not Christ's Church. This is said in no uncharitable or contentious spirit. It is the time for plain speaking of the plain truth, even though it hurts, and the plain truth is that churches which owe their existence to a denial of authority in teaching religion carry on them the stamp of sheep outside the flock of Christ. The Holy Spirit simply cannot be with those who announce as their fundamental charter the principle which destroys, has destroyed, and must destroy, the unity of faith in Christendom. There is only one Church which from the beginning to now has kept itself one in faith and discipline, and that is the Church which is in union with Peter and teaches with the authority of Peter and Peter's Master. . . . The Modernist must

be shown that God really gave a revelation, and the ordinary Protestant must be made to see that if he believes that God gave a revelation, then the only safeguard for that revelation is the Catholic Church." All Protestants are therefore asked not to go to the Bible for their doctrine, but to the Roman Catholic Church; this they are to do because the Roman Catholic Church says that it, and it alone, is the *divinely authorized teacher of religion* in this world. Any one who will not do this, says the same writer, is carrying upon himself *"the stamp of sheep outside the flock of Christ."*

All this does not surprise us. On the contrary, it convinces us anew that the Roman Catholic Church is the Church of Antichrist, that the Reformation was necessary, that the Church of Rome is still the same, and that we, therefore, still must reckon with her as being a destructive religious power in this world.

But why will the Church of Rome not state the position of the Protestant Church correctly? It is evident from the words quoted that the writer in the *America* speaks of private judgment in the sense of private interpretation; in other words, he says that the Protestant Church gives to every man the right to interpret the Bible to suit himself; that a Protestant has no authority in religion; that he has "a distorted notion of what is the proper function of the Church." The principle of private interpretation, says the writer in the *America,* is "the disastrous thing about the Reformation." Neither Luther nor any teacher who has remained true to the principles of the Reformation ever taught such a wicked and disastrous doctrine. By the right of private judgment we mean that man has the right, given to him by God, *to go to the Scriptures directly and learn from them what he should believe or not believe.* The right of private judgment, however, does not give to man the right to interpret the Bible to suit himself. "Not do we assert," says Quenstedt, "that every one should follow his own notions, as the papists accuse our churches of doing, but that he should submit himself to the judgment of the Holy Spirit, recorded in the Scriptures, and examine all things according to the tenor of this decision." How, indeed, could a man know whether what he is taught is the Word of God if he were not permitted to go straight to the source of all true doctrine, the Bible, and then *judge for himself* whether what he has been taught is right or wrong? The very principle of private judgment emphasizes the fact that the Word of God is the only authority in religion. If any one does not from the Bible learn to know and believe the truth, it is not because of any defect in the Bible itself, but because man either misinterprets what the Bible clearly says or wilfully refuses to accept what it teaches. This, we are sorry to say, has been done by many Protestants. The very founders of the Reformed Churches — Zwingli and Calvin — from the very beginning did not accept the Bible as the sole authority in religion, but gave also to human reason the right of private interpretation. The founders of the Reformed Churches had not thoroughly broken with the scholasticism of the Middle Ages. They are now reaping the fruit of their evil sowing. While the theo-

logian of the Reformed Church of former days said with Anselm: *Credo, ut intelligam,* the modern theologian of the Reformed Church — not inconsistently at that — boldly asserts with Abelard: *Non credendum est, nisi prius intellectum.* The deplorable situation in the Protestant Church of our day is not due to an application of the principle of private judgment, but to the fact that this principle has largely been set aside, and that the principle of private interpretation, making human reason an authority in religion, has been put in its place. In their attitude towards the Bible there is no fundamental difference between the Modernist and the Roman Catholic; both displace the Word of God as the sole authority in religious matters and put in its place "another authority," that of the Church or of human reason, concerning which Paul would say, *which is not another authority.* FRITZ.

The "Literary Digest" and Roman Catholicism. — In the *Lutheran Church Herald* (January 15) we find an editorial which for various reasons may be of interest to our readers. We read: —

"The *Literary Digest* is a very interesting weekly with much information. It tries to be impartial and succeeds to a great extent in every department except the one bearing the heading 'Religion and Social Service.' Naturally church controversies have the greatest news value and are played up continually. It is, however, quite evident that the department is under control of a Catholic, who through the selection and elimination of material carries on an effective propaganda for the Catholic Church. By continually playing up the strife and contention within the Protestant Church and winding it up with some fatherly good advice from some Catholic bishop or archbishop, the impression is created that these Protestants really do not know anything about religion or Christianity, have no foundation for their faith, have no Holy Father to direct them, and that therefore there is nothing but 'confusion worse confounded.' Therefore come back to the Holy Mother Church, which is the only true Church on earth! In the January fifth issue 'The Battle of Creeds' is written up in good style, and the story is told about the present fight which has broken out in the Episcopal Church relative to the liberal statements of one Rev. Lee W. Heaton, of Fort Worth, Tex., which caused the bishops of the Church to come forward with a statement ordered read in all the churches. The write-up closes with a choice selection from Archbishop Haynes, head of the Roman Catholic Church of New York, and gives him the glory for having spoken a good word in this crisis. We cannot remember that the *Literary Digest* has ever happened to discover any sensational church news reflecting upon the Holy Catholic Church, although there are many things of 'news value,' even sensational things, which have transpired within the sacred precincts of the Catholic Church. It requires no Sherlock Holmes to discover the fine Italian hand controlling this department of the *Digest.*"

It might be added that the *Literary Digest* has frequently been unfair to the Lutheran Church, especially during the recent war.

Again, its treatment of the Lutheran position toward parochial schools was, to say the least, misleading. Lastly, the *Literary Digest* has not been impartial in discussing the warfare of science against revealed religion. Quite insidiously it has given the advantage to the unbelieving scientist. MUELLER.

Spiritism a Fraud. — The *Lutheran* (January 10) quotes an exchange which recites the following comment on tests of "spirit" phenomena: —

"It will be recalled that the *Scientific American* some time ago offered $5,000 for reliable proof of communication with the spirit world. A committee of distinguished scientists was appointed to investigate the attempts which might be made. Thus far they have all been conclusively shown to be frauds. Mrs. Josie K. Stewart, of Cleveland, was perhaps the most skilful. She tried to produce spirit writings. The cards were furnished by the committee to prevent fraud. She failed in several attempts in New York City. Then she suggested that they go out into the country and commune with nature. So the scene was shifted to a flower-garden. Nothing appeared. She finally experimented by throwing the cards into a bed of nasturtiums. When they were picked up, faint writing was visible. The message was the familiar 'Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,' and, 'How happy I should have been for such an opportunity as this!' signed: 'William James'; and this: 'May this demonstration be conclusive evidence of the return of spirits to earth!' signed: 'A Friend of Mrs. Stewart,' and followed by the bare signature of 'William T. Stead.' The communication closed with: 'We, who love you, are doing all we can to establish the truth.' This was signed by Mrs. Stewart's 'guardian angel and spirit guide.' The medium was very happy over her triumph until the committee informed her that the paper used was not what they had given her, but a clever substitute. The committee had procured paper of a certain shade, an unusual size, differing so little from the ordinary paper of that kind that it could scarce be detected by the naked eye. Her triumph was turned into defeat and shame. It seems almost time that people would recognize that the whole system of Psychic Communication is fraudulent."

The spiritistic craze, although it has become less conspicuous, is not yet over. In spite of all that has been said against it, its quiet propaganda continues with much success. While it is true that Spiritism must first be opposed on Scriptural grounds, — since there is in this ungodly cult a diabolical element, — it is of importance to point out again and again that it is not only a satanic delusion, but also an abominable fraud. MUELLER.

Slow Suicide among Our Native Stock. — It might be well to call the attention of our pastors to an instructive article under this heading in the *Century Magazine* (February) by Edward A. Ross, Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, and Ray E. Baber, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Illinois. On the basis of accurate statistics the two sociologists show that our

native American stock, considering the present birth-rate, is bound to become extinct. We read: —

"There is need of enlightening people as to what family survival implies. Some couples imagine that by rearing one child they have handed on the torch of life. Many suppose that two children insure the perpetuation of their stock. The fact is that among this middle-class native stock, with our present rates of mortality, celibacy, and infertility, only those averaging 3.6 children are above the survival line. In general, it is only the family with four or more births that can count on producing a father and a mother from among the children. Now, not many capables contemplate with indifference the extinction of their line. Most of these 'present-generation' couples we studied could have added a child or two without seriously curtailing family comfort or the educational chances of their children. Had they been well instructed as to the family and racial consequences of overlimitation, would not the majority of them have expanded their families well above the danger-line?"

As a remedy against family suicide the professors suggest the necessity of correcting our philosophy of success. We read: —

"We have been glorifying the achievement of the individual rather than that of the family. We ask, 'What has he done?' but not, 'What are his children and grandchildren doing or likely to do?' With their costly motor-cars, Oriental rugs, and European tours the childless or one-child couples are accounted more to be envied than the equally capable couple who miss these things because they are rearing four high-bred, well-educated children. When the public rates success more in terms of offspring, more couples will consent to rear a family."

This does not mean that rational birth control should not be exercised; for "to return to blind fecundity is no remedy. In view of our current success in lowering the death-rate, such a course would be madness. To-day, among the mountaineers of the Southern Appalachians, the number of children born into the family ranges from seven to fifteen. A child a year is a common schedule. The result is not only decrepitude or death before middle life for all but the strongest women, but a multiplication so rapid that rural slums are forming. The farms are smaller, the cabins tinier, the streams fouler, and the larders leaner than they were a generation ago. In a time when four births per fertile couple will maintain population a general return to families of from seven to fifteen would soon make us worse off than the masses in China."

Nevertheless, the present outlook with regard to the perpetuation of the American stock is unsatisfactory. We are told: —

"If the coming generations should follow the example of the 'present generation' in having only three-fifths as many offspring as its parents, we should have the 5.44 family of the 1860's, which shrank to 3.35 in the 1890's, go on to shrivel to 2.06 in the present decade, to 1.27 in the 1950's, and to .78 of a child in the 1990's. By then the family would in four generations have shriveled to a fortieth of its

erstwhile importance. There is little likelihood, of course, that shrinkage will continue so fast; but, whether they shrink more slowly or hover at their present size, these native families are a thinning strand in the American people. . . . In the 'present generation' the farmer leads with 4.2 per fertile family; unskilled labor, 3.7; skilled labor, 3.3; professional men, 3.2; business men, 2.9; clerical, 2.6. But the professional men make a poorer showing if we omit the clergymen, who average four children to a family. Without them the average product of the professional men is three children."

Even sociologists are alarmed at the situation now confronting us. "Is our present generation replacing itself?" they ask. "The farmers, yes; but none of the other groups. Here are 100 mothers who have survived the child-bearing period. They have produced 335 children, one half of them girls. Allowing for those who die, who fail to marry, and who are infertile, will there be found among these girls 100 mothers who will survive until their forty-fifth year? No. At least a third more babies should be born if this native middle class is to replace itself. It is now committing slow suicide. In a century it will have shrunken to a mere half of its present numbers, while contained in a nation twice as populous as now."

The moral side of the question has not been considered. In the essay only the economic and social features have been stressed. For a Christian the problem involves much more. The article shows that almost our entire American population is living in direct violation of God's laws. Viewed from this point, the situation is all the more deplorable. The duty of Christian pastors and educators seems clear. They must, in their sermons and lectures, also touch upon this subject, which is now receiving nation-wide discussion. God has made His will very clear when He said: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

MUELLER.

Spain's Faith and Achievements. — The *Catholic World* (February) quotes a portion of King Alfonso's address to the Pope as published in the *Tablet* (London), December 1, 1923. The address, at least so far as it is quoted, is a masterpiece of cunning deception and of execrable misrepresentation. Among other things, King Alfonso said: —

"The preaching of the Apostle St. James and the Apparition of the Virgin in Pilar of Saragossa marked out my people as the favored of Providence; the fusion of all the races spread over the soil of Spain under the scepter of Recerado, tinted with the blood of martyrdom, foretold then my people's mission throughout history to be the soldiers of religion, the unfailing defenders of the Catholic Church. And so, when the followers of Mahomet overran our peninsula, in the battles of giants, in a struggle that lasted for centuries, our ancestors set up a rampart against that rush of barbarian hordes threatening Europe and the Church of Jesus Christ, and succeeded in throwing back the children of Islam into their African deserts. . . . In defense of religion against the followers of Luther our heroes

flocked to the dunes of Flanders and the banks of the Elbe, just as before then, at Alarcos, Las Navas, Salado, Granada, the Arabs had found arrayed against them those knights of story, gentle lambs at the sound of the bell calling to prayer, lions at the ring of the trumpet calling to the fight, the military religious orders of Santiago, Calatrava, Alcantara, Montesa, whose emblems as Grand Master, by Apostolic Delegation, I am proud to bear on my breast as scapular of my creed, symbol of my profound faith. . . . For the glory of religion and the greatness of our country our universities with their teaching, our artists with their genius, our codes of law with their Christian legislation, our martyrs with their blood, our missionaries carrying the Gospel to the farthest points of earth, our theologians who made Trent marvel at their learning, our mystics who gave to our tongue the language of angels, our people with their customs and age-long traditions, acclaim throughout the ages that all the greatness, all the ideals, all the glories of Spain are born of the blessed land which is constituted of patriotism and religion; for our soldiers, explorers, missionaries, sailors, kings, in numbers surpassing the sands of the desert, in enlightenment leaving a shining wake in the annals of humanity, never raised a flag of Spain that had not the cross on it; and when they discovered the new world and created the twenty nations of the American Continent, they put in the hearts of those peoples the flame of the faith of Christ before putting on their lips the virile language of Cervantes. The faith of my people, Holy Father, has never weakened, nor by a speck is lessened that faith which my mother taught me in childhood, which still burns in my heart, witness of which was my consecration of Spain to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus on the hill of Los Angeles amid the acclamation of all my subjects and in the presence of my Government."

The address shows that King Alfonso is a devoted slave to the Pope, and that he has neither studied history nor learned the lessons which the history of Spain, especially that part touching on the infamous cruelty of the Spanish Jesuits and their henchmen, should have taught him. The history of Spain, especially since the Reformation, is written in blood. It is a dreary task to write of the wholesale murder of Protestants and of the Indians whose territory the Spanish conquerors invaded. Yet it is a most instructive task, for it shows that Spain, in slaughtering others, was striking the dagger of suicide into its own heart. Above all, it proves the dreadfulness of the papacy and the utter hopelessness and despair of those who yield to its power. Spain to-day is a picture of what Europe would have been had not Luther restored the light of the Gospel truth. It would have been well for Spain to have accepted that light.

MUELLER.

The abnormal growth of Roman Catholic influence in Lutheran countries, especially in Germany, is described for the Publicity Bureau of the National Lutheran Council by Dr. E. Stange, Leipzig, as follows: —

"The attention of the Protestant world was called to the danger

of the aggressive tactics of Rome in Lutheran Europe by the theft of St. Jacobi Church of Riga by the Catholic Church. Everywhere there are signs of similar activities and ambitions. Finland, with a Catholic population of only 2,000, has a bishop. Esthonia, which has almost no Catholic population, also has a bishop and was visited by a special papal nuncio. The same is true of Denmark and Sweden, and even Holland and Switzerland complain of increasing demands for power by Rome.

"Nowhere, however, are the aggressive tactics of Rome more apparent at this time than in Germany. The great Catholic party of the Center occupies a political position which is most advantageous for Rome. Its members include those with radical as well as conservative leanings, and, accordingly, the party at the opportune moment is able to sway to either side. Before the war it generally sided with the Conservatives, but since the revolution it has allied itself closely with the Social Democrats. In this way it becomes the deciding factor in almost every issue.

"It is necessary to realize that there are two Evangelicals in Germany to one Catholic in order to understand the significance of the following figures: The German republic since the revolution has had four Catholic chancellors and only one Evangelical (Stresemann). President Ebert, who formerly had no church-connection whatever, has recently shown his inclination to return to the Catholic Church, into which he was born. Most of the ministers of the Reich, if not unbelievers, are members of the Catholic faith. This opportunity has been grasped by Rome to install for the first time since the existence of the empire a papal nuncio at Berlin. His influence is very apparent in Germany's political life.

"Rome can also claim successes in other regions, for instance, in the field of public education. The percentage of Evangelical and Catholic pupils in the Rhine region is about equal. Still there are three Catholic teachers to two Evangelicals. The Center party recently demanded that chairs of Catholic Philosophy (*Weltanschauung*) be created in all universities where no special Catholic theological faculty exists. This is to be done by the state. Such chairs have since been installed in Koenigsberg, Goettingen, Frankfurt, Berlin, and Breslau. Considerable influence, also upon the Evangelical students, is exerted by these new professors.

"The organization of the Romish Church has grown in a most striking manner during these last years. Since 1919 in Prussia 153 new Catholic parishes were founded and only 56 Evangelical parishes. In two years 463 new monasteries have been opened in Germany. Through their activity in nursing the sick and caring for the young the Catholic orders are gaining an increasing influence. The capital, Berlin, last year became the seat of a Catholic bishop.

"If one realizes the suffering Germany is undergoing at this time, it becomes apparent that all this Catholic growth was made possible only through large financial assistance from the outside world. This opportunity Rome certainly used to the utmost.

"At present we face the danger of a separate concordat between the German government and the Pope. By such a measure Evangelical Germany would be placed in a most precarious situation. We have no Evangelical political party which could oppose the Catholic Center party in Parliament. We do not hold it to be right for the Church to enter into politics. Our weapon is our Lutheran faith. And our profound hope is that this faith will take firm root in the hearts of our Evangelical youth." DAU.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — The congregations of the Breslau Synod in Germany which are located in Poland will be organized as a separate synod, but remain in affiliation with the mother synod.

Schrift und Bekenntnis the quarterly theological supplement of the organ of our brethren in the *Freikirche* of Saxony, will suspend publication for lack of funds.

Bible criticism is forcing a new division in the *Evangeliska Fosterlands-Stiftelsen* in Sweden. Komminister J. Lindgren, representing Prof. Kolmodin's view of the Bible, is opposed by Rector Olson. The differences are being fought out in the daily papers of Sweden. *Stiftelsen* is also in financial straits.

A *Blaesermission* has been instituted by the young people of the *Freikirche* in Germany. They have organized music bands which play Lutheran chorals before the houses in city or village. One member of the band bears a placard aloft on which the time and place of the next service of the respective congregation is announced.

Our brethren in Australia have decided to call an editor for their synodical organ who is to give his entire time to this and other publications of their synod. The first person called, Praeses Janzow, declined the call.

Dr. Manhart thinks that by the visit of the Swedish archbishop the movement to create the episcopal office in the Lutheran Church in America may have been accelerated. He would have the presidents of synods or other properly selected persons made bishops, and Soederblom might be called upon to perform the act of ordination. "Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord!"

The Fundamentalists have begun a campaign of quizzing the professors of the country in Christian institutions on their beliefs. Ottawa University in Kansas received a questionnaire on fundamentals recently.

Bank Director Kurt Fiedler, a member of our *Freikirche* congregation at Leipzig, warns Americans not to believe the current reports about Germans crowding the hotels in Switzerland and Italy and spending money lavishly. The Germans who are able to do this answer to some such name as Isidor Veilchenstengel, and the money which they spend is the money which the rest of the Germans who stay at home had to pay them because of the wonderful political arrangement which the confiding Germans adopted by the advice of Americans.

Arthur Brisbane, syndicated scribe, we believe, of sundry newspapers, deserves to be examined as to the extent of his knowledge of

the writings of Luther. In an article, "What is Love?" in the *Chicago Herald-Examiner* (February 10) he cites "men of bigger caliber" who have expressed an opinion on his subject and thinks Luther's is the worst, because he looks upon woman merely as a kitchen implement or "any other piece of household furniture." The next time you want to ascertain Luther's position on anything ask Arthur Brisbane.

Dr. J. H. Latane, dean of Johns Hopkins University, at a luncheon in Baltimore on February 13, reviewed our "Volstead brand of diplomacy" and the activities of "the antisaloon crowd," whom he charged with having flatly violated the time-honored American principle of the freedom of the seas, saying: "Through the efforts of the Antisaloon League the territorial limits of the country have been arbitrarily extended for the protection of one pet principle. The antisaloon crowd has introduced the most damnable policy the world has ever seen. No matter what a man's stand may be on personal or public matters, the Antisaloon League asks him one question, and only one. If his answer to this is unsatisfactory, it knifes him." Our Volstead diplomacy will be extended to many other "freedoms" to make it efficient. If it was right for us to say a, we must consistently say b and c and d, down to z, though we gnash our teeth while following the lead of our logic.

According to *Svenska Kyrkan's Aarbok for 1924* one-fourth of all the Lutherans in Europe are living in Scandinavian countries and Finland; Sweden had 5,863,929 in 1923; Norway, 2,596,917 in 1921; Denmark, 3,200,372 in 1921; Iceland, 94,220; Finland, 3,335,395; total, 15,090,833.

Not only Lutheran, but also other church-papers are telling their readers how the Roman Catholics obtained possession of the Lutheran St. Jacobi Church at Riga, in Latvia. "Remember St. Jacobi!" would be a good slogan for all who are resisting Roman aggression.

The Centrist party in the German Diet insists that Catholic theologians must be appointed professors at some of the great German universities. This makes it a little easier to understand why the non-religious German republic retained the theological faculties at its universities. DAU.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.: —

Special Problems of the Christian Day-School. Concordia Teachers' Library, Vol. VIII. *Paul T. Buszin, C. H. Seltz, Theo. Kuehnert, A. A. Grossmann, Paul E. Kretzmann.* 136 pages, 5½×8½. $1.00.

The essays contributed to Vol. VIII of the Concordia Teachers' Library by four superintendents of schools and Dr. Kretzmann touch upon a great variety of educational topics of interest to the modern teacher and so effectively treat questions of method and school management that the book has been introduced as class text in the reviewer's class in Methods of Teaching at Concordia Seminary. GRAEBNER.

Synodalhandbuch der Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und andern Staaten. 184 pages, 4¼×6¼. 90 cts.

For more than two years the *Synodalhandbuch* has been out of print. The delay in getting out a new edition was due to the fact that our Synod revised its constitution and by-laws, not making essential changes, but making them conform to conditions which arose as a result of the expansion of our work. Also in various regulations for boards, changes were made, and some new regulations were added. This *Synodalhandbuch* also contains the constitution of the Synodical Conference. The book has 184 pages, including an index. A committee, on which Dr. L. Fuerbringer did the main work, was instructed and authorized by our Synod to get out this official handbook. To all officers and all pastors of our Synod this book is indispensable. Also laymen, especially officers in our churches, would do well to purchase a copy and familiarize themselves with its contents. An English translation is being gotten out. FRITZ.

Verhandlungen der achtundzwanzigsten Versammlung der Ev.-Luth. Synodalkonferenz von Nordamerika. 56 pages. 40 cts.

Although the meeting of the Synodical Conference was held in the month of August, 1922, the printed report has not been issued until now. Some provision ought to be made to have reports issued immediately after the adjournment of any synodical meeting. The subject, *Der Kampf um unser Schulwesen*, treated in the paper read before the Conference by Prof. J. P. Meyer, has, however, in the mean time not become less interesting to us. FRITZ.

Home Department Questions on Primary Leaflets. 5 cts. per set.

In issuing these question sheets on the Primary Leaflets of our Sunday-school series, a new idea in Christian education is being tried out. The question sheets are intended for children who have not the opportunity to attend a Christian day-school or a Christian Sunday-school. The sheets contain questions which the child is to answer in the space provided, and then it is to return the paper to the pastor who had mailed them. The question sheets are at present sold only in complete sets of eight lessons to the set, all enclosed in an envelope. They cannot be mailed periodically. FRITZ.

Ein rechter Freundesbrief. Ein wirklich an einen vormaligen Lehrer und jetziges Glied der *Elks* geschriebener Brief. Single copies, 5 cts.; dozen, 48 cts.; 100, $3.33, plus postage.

Pastors who can use a German tract to enlighten the people not only with reference to the Elks, but also as to the antichristian character of other lodges will, we take it, be glad to make use of this letter, which has been issued by our Publishing House as Tract No. 162. FRITZ.

My Savior Lives! A complete program for children's Easter services. *H. R. Charlé.* 7 pages. Single copies, 5 cts.; dozen, 50 cts.; 100, $3.50, plus postage.

While in the Church there dare be no change as to essentials, these having been fixed by the Lord Himself, yet as to their presentation and as

to methods of work there can and ought to be variety. The new Easter program by Charlé differs from the usual program inasmuch as it presents the Easter-message in verse. FRITZ.

Concordia Report Card. Revised edition. Price, 75 cts. per hundred.

This card is a revised edition of the Concordia School Report Card. FRITZ.

The Macmillan Company, New York, N. Y.: —

Christianity and Liberalism. *J. Gresham Machen, D. D.,* assistant professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. 189 pages. $1.00.

This book was reviewed in this publication last year (see Vol. III, p. 189). At that time the reviewer said: "Now and then at least the heart of the reviewer is gladdened by the sight of a good book which is really worth while studying. Dr. Machen's *Christianity and Liberalism* is a book of this kind." Dr. Machen's book was first published in February, 1923. We are glad that the first edition was soon sold out, and that the publishers were encouraged to reprint it in February of this year. We are therefore pleased to call attention to it again. As the title states, Dr. Machen contrasts Christianity with modern liberalism. He says: "In the sphere of religion, in particular, the present time is a time of conflict; the great redemptive religion, which has always been known as Christianity, is battling against a totally diverse type of religious belief, which is only the more destructive of the Christian faith because it makes use of traditional Christian terminology. This modern non-redemptive religion is called 'modernism' or 'liberalism.' Both names are unsatisfactory; the latter, in particular, is question-begging. The movement designated as 'liberalism' is regarded as 'liberal' only by its friends; to its opponents it seems to involve a narrow ignoring of many relevant facts. And, indeed, the movement is so various in its manifestations that one may almost despair of finding any common name which will apply to all its forms. But manifold as are the forms in which the movement appears, the root of the movement is one; the many varieties of modern liberal religion are rooted in naturalism, that is, in the denial of any entrance of the creative power of God (as distinguished from the ordinary course of nature) in connection with the origin of Christianity." Dr. Machen exposes the evil root out of which modern liberalism has grown. Speaking of the "immanence of God," which is one of the chief dogmas of modern liberalism, he says: "Modern liberalism, even when it is not consistently pantheistic, is at any rate pantheizing. It tends everywhere to break down the separateness between God and the world and the sharp personal distinction between God and man.... Modern liberalism has lost all sense of the gulf that separates the creature from the Creator; its doctrine of man follows naturally from its doctrine of God. But it is not only the creature limitations of mankind which are denied. Even more important is another difference. According to the Bible, man is a sinner, under the just condemnation of God; according to modern liberalism there is really no such thing as sin. At the very root of the modern liberal movement is the loss of the consciousness of sin.... But the loss of the consciousness of sin is far deeper than the war; it has its roots in a mighty spiritual process,

which has been active during the past seventy-five years. Like other great movements, that process has come silently, so silently that its results have been achieved before the plain man was even aware of what was taking place. Nevertheless, despite all superficial continuity, a remarkable change has come about within the last seventy-five years. The change is nothing less than the substitution of paganism for Christianity as the dominant view of life. Seventy-five years ago Western civilization, despite inconsistencies, was still predominantly Christian; to-day it is predominantly pagan." Being pantheistic, modern liberalism denies a personal God; denying a personal God by identifying God with the world and therefore also with man, modern liberalism denies the fact of sin in man, the need of atonement, the fact of the supernatural (miracles), and the fact of a revelation (the inspired Scriptures) coming from without. A heaven for the believer in Jesus, the Savior, has no place in the religion of modern liberalism, for its religion is merely a *Diesseitigkeitsreligion.*

In his introductory chapter Dr. Machen shows that the modern liberalistic tendency is, if it be permitted to go on unchecked, depriving us of true liberty in the Church and in the State. He says: "The whole development of modern society has tended mightily toward the limitation of the realm of freedom for the individual man." In this connection the author also says some very refreshing things in connection with education and the school laws of Nebraska and Oregon. The author writes: "Such laws, which, if the present temper of the people prevails, will probably soon be extended far beyond the bounds of one State, mean, of course, the ultimate destruction of all real education. When one considers what the public schools of America in many places already are, — their materialism, their discouragement of any sustained intellectual effort, their encouragement of the dangerous pseudoscientific fads of experimental psychology, — one can only be appalled by the thought of a commonwealth in which there is no escape from such a soul-killing system. But the principle of such laws and their ultimate tendency are far worse than the immediate results. A public school system, in itself, is indeed of enormous benefit to the race. But it is of benefit only if it is kept healthy at every moment by the absolutely free possibility of the competition of private schools. A public school system, if it means the providing of free education for those who desire it, is a noteworthy and beneficent achievement of modern times; but when once it becomes monopolistic, it is the most perfect instrument of tyranny which has yet been devised. Freedom of thought in the Middle Ages was combated by the Inquisition, but the modern method is far more effective. Place the lives of children in their formative years, despite the convictions of their parents, under the intimate control of experts appointed by the state, force them then to attend schools where the higher aspirations of humanity are crushed out, and where the mind is filled with the materialism of the day, and it is difficult to see how even the remnants of liberty can subsist. Such a tyranny, supported as it is by a perverse technique used as the instrument in destroying human souls, is certainly far more dangerous than the crude tyrannies of the past, which, despite their weapons of fire and sword, permitted thought at least to be free."

As much as we respect the outspoken, conservative position of Dr. Machen on the fundamentals of Christianity, we cannot, of course, agree with him when, referring to the colloquy at Marburg, he says that Luther "was wrong about the Lord's Supper." In the same connection, however, Dr. Machen praises Luther for not treating the question as a "trifling affair." Dr. Machen may speak for himself: "It was a great calamity when at the 'Marburg Conference' between Luther and the representatives of the Swiss Reformation, Luther wrote on the table with regard to the Lord's Supper, 'This is My body,' and said to Zwingli and Oecolampadius, 'You have another spirit.' That difference of opinion led to the breach between the Lutheran and the Reformed branches of the Church and caused Protestantism to lose much of the ground that might otherwise have been gained. It was a great calamity indeed. But the calamity was due to the fact that Luther (as we believe) was wrong about the Lord's Supper; and it would have been a far greater calamity if, being wrong about the Supper, he had represented the whole question as a trifling affair. Luther was wrong about the Supper, but not nearly so wrong as he would have been if, being wrong, he had said to his opponents: 'Brethren, this matter is a trifle, and it makes really very little difference what a man thinks about the table of the Lord.' Such indifferentism would have been far more deadly than all the divisions between the branches of the Church. A Luther who would have compromised with regard to the Lord's Supper never would have said at the Diet of Worms, 'Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; God help me! Amen.' Indifferentism about doctrine makes no heroes of the faith."

The fact, after all, is that Luther's opponents at Marburg *did not agree*, and that Luther had the plain and clear words of Scripture, "This *is* My body," "This *is* My blood," in his favor.

We hold that the very wrong principle of Scripture interpretation which Zwingli and the theologians of the Reformed churches applied, to wit, that their human reason was permitted to dictate the interpretation of the Bible, has by its more consistent application, as time ran on, and by its own momentum, helped to usher in rationalism, which has caused much havoc in the Church, and which to-day, in the form of modern liberalism, is destroying many souls.

We do not, however, hesitate to recommend Dr. Machen's book. His book makes refreshing reading in these evil times. It is a good companion volume to *Modern Religious Liberalism* by John Horsch, published a few years ago. None of our pastors who purchase and study Dr. Machen's book will regret having spent the one dollar which the book costs. FRITZ.

Corrections.

In Dr. Kieffer's Lutheran statistics, published in our March issue, the following corrections should be noted: increase of baptized membership from 1921 to 1922: strike out 77,610 and insert 30,572; increase of communicant membership: strike out 82,344 and insert 5,516; increase of confirmed membership: strike out 101,492 and insert 12,824. DAU.